

University of Groningen

The Apocryphal Acts Of Andrew

Bremmer, Jan N.

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2000

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bremmer, J. N. (2000). *The Apocryphal Acts Of Andrew*. (5 ed.) Leuven: Peeters.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

II. Man, Magic, and Martyrdom in the Acts of Andrew

JAN N. BREMMER

Of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (AAA), less has been preserved of the *Acts of Andrew* (AA) than of any of the other *Acts*, although the recent edition by Prieur has made considerable progress in comparison with earlier editions¹. Fortunately, its general plan still remains visible in the reworking by Gregory of Tours of the lost Latin translation (*AAlat*), but this skeleton version has surely robbed us of many details which might have enabled us to determine with more certainty where and when the author lived and worked. Confronted with these handicaps, what can we nevertheless say about the author?

According to Prieur, the AA could just as easily have been composed in 'Greece as in Asia Minor, Syria or Egypt'². The last region is not a very strong possibility, since the name of one of the protagonists of AA, Maximilla (to whom we will return below), is not attested for Egypt³. Prieur has also overlooked the fact that our author uses the expression 'first of the city': in the Pontic town of Amasea Andrew resurrected an Egyptian slave of *Demetrii... primi civitatis Amaseorum* (*AAlat* 3). This expression, variants of which also occur in the *AJ* and *AP*⁴, was probably inspired by local custom, since a Pontic inscription mentions a grandson of an '*andros proteuontos en tei metropolei Amaseiai*'⁵. As the author of the AA knew the *APt*, which may well have

¹ J.-M. Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 2 vols (Turnhout, 1989).

² Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 414-64 and *NTA* II, 115.

³ As a computer search in the papyri and inscriptions has shown.

⁴ See my 'The Novel and the Apocryphal Acts: Place, Time and Readership', in H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman (eds), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel IX* (Groningen, 1998) 157-80 at 165-70.

⁵ IGR III.115, republished by B. Le Guen Pollet, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 13 (1989) 65-6 and T.B. Mitford, *ZPE* 87 (1991) 181-243, no. 12.

been written in Bithynia, but also the *AJ*⁶, we may at least wonder whether the *AA* was not written in Pontus: a Pontic origin would explain the awkward scope of the *AA*, which somewhat uneasily combines a stay in Pontus and Bithynia with a death in Achaia. In any case, its vocabulary of elite and civic virtues (below) makes it unlikely to have been written anywhere other than in Asia Minor.

Such an origin is also supported by the mention of the wife of the proconsul Lesbios and her steward (*AAlat* 23). Although a real Roman proconsul could have taken his wife with him to his province, he would have hardly taken along her steward⁷. On the other hand, stewards (*oikonomos* or *pragmateutes*) of wealthy Greek women are epigraphically attested, especially in areas with large estates, such as Central Anatolia and Bithynia, and they must have been a sufficiently common and distinctive feature for the author of the *Historia Apollonii Tyrii* (31 RA, RB) to introduce one into his novel⁸. In this respect too our text points to Asia Minor.

What else can we say about the author? Most likely, he was a cultivated man. He was not only well versed in Platonic philosophy⁹, but also mentions a woman Calliope (the name of one of the Muses: *AAlat* 25), a slave Alcmanes (a probable reference to the famous Spartan poet Alcman: 4, *AAlat* 34), a Sinopean citizen Gratinus (probably Cratinus, the name of the famous poet of Old Comedy: *AAlat* 5), a Megarian citizen Antiphanes (the name of a famous poet of Middle Comedy: 15; *AAlat* 29), and the proconsul Lesbios, whose name in this literary company evokes the island of Lesbos, famous for its poets Alcaeus and Sappho (*AAlat* 22)¹⁰. One may be sceptical

⁶ *AA* and *APt*: Prieur, in *NTA* II, 115. Date and place of *APt*: Bremmer, *Acts of Peter*, 14-20. *AJ*: Lalleman, this volume, Ch. XII.

⁷ For stewards see J. Carlsen, *Vilici and Roman Estate Managers until AD 284* (Rome, 1995); Wives: M.T. Raepsaet-Charlier, 'Épouses et familles de magistrats dans les provinces romaines aux deux premiers siècles de l'empire', *Historia* 31 (1982) 56-70.

⁸ *Oikonomos*: *SEG* 43.441 (*BCH* 1993, 384-94); *I. Iznik* 196, 1062, 1201, 1208; *RECAM* ii.324; L. Robert, *BCH* 103 (1979) 429 n. 13; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia I* (Oxford, 1993) 160; R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation* (Amsterdam, 1996) 267-9.

⁹ See Schroeder, this volume, Ch. X.

¹⁰ Prieur misses all these literary references, except Alcmanes. A literary interpretation of the name Cratinus is supported by its virtual absence in second-century Asia Minor.

about these identifications, but our author was certainly sensitive to names. It can hardly be chance that the wife of the proconsul Lesbios was called 'the most beautiful', Callista (AAlat 23), and the wife of the proconsul Aegeates 'the most important', Maximilla, even though the latter name was not very common in the Greek world.

There are also other indications that our author did not belong to the lowest strata of his city. Any reader of the AA will be struck by the stress on 'gentleness' in our text. Antiphanes invokes Andrew's help with the words: 'if there is any gentleness (*bonitas*) in you' (AAlat 29), just as all the men of Thessalonica loved a young man, Exuos (Exuor, Exoos, Exuus), for 'his gentleness and mildness' (*bonitatem et mansuetudinem*: AAlat 12) after his resurrection. And when Stratocles is introduced into the story, he is said to have 'fulfilled his proper duty to his friends, bearing himself kindly (*prosênôs*) to all and greeting all in gracious (*epieikôs*) and seemly (*metrios*) fashion' (1).

These words were key terms of Greek civic life and regularly recur in the honorific decrees so abundantly displayed in the Greek cities of Hellenistic and Roman times. The most frequent of the three Greek terms in the characterisation of Stratocles was *epieikês*, 'reasonable', which in the course of time came to mean 'fair'¹¹, whereas *metrios* meant 'moderate', and *prosênês* 'gentle'; the latter quality even came to be reflected in names¹². Sometimes the terms occur in combinations, as in the case of the above mentioned Exuos, who was praised for what in Greek may have been called his *praotês kai epieikeia*, a combination rather popular in Aphrodisias¹³. In all these cases the stress on moderation and mildness is an indication of the growing judicial cruelty of the period which needed to be counter-balanced by praising the moderation and gentleness of the *grands*

¹¹ L. Robert, *Hellenica* IV (1948) 15-8, 133 and XIII (1965) 223-4; J. de Romilly, *La douceur dans la pensée grecque* (Paris, 1979) 269-70; L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios* (Washington, 1994) 63-4; SEG 43.850.

¹² *Prosênês*: Robert, *Hellenica* IV, 133; De Romilly, *Douceur*, 271; SEG 35.1330. Names: H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom* (Berlin and New York, 1982) II.775 and *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen* (Stuttgart, 1996) II.426. *Metrios*: C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néotestamentaire* II (Freiburg and Göttingen, 1978) 563-5; TAM II.3.739; SEG 35.1363.

¹³ De Romilly, *La douceur*, 269.

*seigneurs*¹⁴. But whereas at first these terms denoted important civic virtues, they subsequently came to be used to denote more personal qualities, as in our examples¹⁵. The use of these terms, then, shows that our author was a man well acquainted with the ethical vocabulary of his time and thus, probably, a representative of the higher classes.

The author's theological views have been well studied by Prieur, who has concluded that they have much in common with Gnosticism. His contempt for the flesh also displays itself in his propagation of a very simple diet, encratism and the renunciation of sexuality¹⁶. This last element is demonstrated by various scenes, one of which deserves a closer look. In Philippi, Andrew prevented a wedding between two pairs of cousins (*AAlat* 11). The moment itself is narrated with a feeling for drama, since the marriage is nearly consummated and the parents are already wearing the wedding garlands, as befitted such a festive event. At that very moment, the apostle arrived and spoilt the party. Prieur has persuasively suggested that Gregory has tinkered with the story, but the question is of course in what way he did so¹⁷.

A marriage in the urban elite between the children of brothers, so-called parallel cousins, was not uncommon at the time of the *AA*. In fact, Achilles Tatius' contemporary novel *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is a striking example, since the homonymous protagonists of the novel are the children of two brothers. Achilles Tatius probably came from southern Anatolia, the same region where we have situated the *AJ* and *AP*¹⁸, and it is exactly in Lycia that endogamy in the elite is repeatedly attested¹⁹. Another interesting example can be

¹⁴ See also C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. Supplément* (Freiburg and Göttingen, 1982) 570-82. For the growing cruelty see R. MacMullen, 'Judicial Savagery in the Roman Empire', in his *Changes in the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 1990) 204-17, 357-64 (notes).

¹⁵ Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios*, 63.

¹⁶ Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 319-30.

¹⁷ Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 42f.

¹⁸ Bremmer, 'The Novel', 165-8.

¹⁹ S. Pembroke, 'Last of the Matriarchs: a study in the inscriptions of Lycia', *J. Ec. Soc. Hist. Orient* 8 (1965, 217-47) 231 n. 2; A. Balland, *Inscriptions du Létôon* (Paris, 1981) 152ff; M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest*, 70; M. Adak, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 26 (1996) 136.

found in Apuleius (*Met.* 4.26), whose Greek model, the *Metamorphoseis* ascribed to 'Lucius of Patrai', was probably also composed in Southern Anatolia²⁰. Here a girl relates that on the very day of her wedding bandits had taken her away from her intended husband and *consobrinus*, 'cousin', whom *omnis civitas* had elected as *filium publicum*, that is, as 'son of the city', a honorary title especially popular, once again, in Southern Anatolia in the second century²¹. Her husband-to-be was also three years older than herself, an interesting indication of the age difference at marriage in the region²².

On the other hand, Prieur is quite right in stating that incest between cousins was not objectionable in those days. In fact, the prohibition of a marriage between cousins appears first in the Councils of Epaon (AD 517: *canon* 30) and Auxerre (*canon* 31), that is, in the time of Gregory himself. Unfortunately, the date of the latter Council is debated. If it indeed took place some time after AD 585, as the latest discussion hesitantly suggests, that would be an additional argument for dating the *Liber de miraculis* to Gregory's last years, since 'incest' between cousins does not seem to have been a burning issue in the earlier part of the sixth century²³. In any case, in the original AA the episode will have been directed against marriage rather than against incest.

So when did the intellectual from Asia Minor write the AA? On the basis of the absence of institutional details and of their Christology, Prieur has suggested that the AA were composed 'probably about 150 rather than about 200'. However, in the first English edition of NTA, M. Hornschuh pointed to AA's close contacts with Tat-

²⁰ Bremmer, 'The Novel', 168.

²¹ Bandits: for the most recent bibliography see B. McGing, 'Bandits, Real and Imagined, in Greco-Roman Egypt', *Bull. Am. Soc. Papyr.* 35 (1998) 159-83. 'Son of the city': Van Bremen, *Limits of Participation*, 167-9.

²² Add the example to the material in Bremmer, *Acts of Peter*, 2.

²³ P. Mikat, *Die Inzestgesetzgebung der merowingisch-fränkischen Konzilien (511-626/7)* (Paderborn, 1994) 119f (Epaon), 131f (Auxerre); add to his bibliography M. de Jong, 'To the Limits of Kinship: anti-incest legislation in the early medieval west (500-900)', in Bremmer (ed), *From Sappho to De Sade. Moments in the History of Sexuality* (London, 1989) 36-59. Late date of *Liber*: J. Flamion, *Les Actes Apocryphes de l'Apôtre André* (Louvain, 1911) 54f.

ian's theology and therefore suggested a date closer to, but not after, 190, particularly considering the AA's close relationship with the *APt*, a relationship also accepted by Prieur²⁴.

Such a date of origin for the AA, close to 200, is supported by the development already observed from civic virtues towards personal characteristics as reflected in the AA. There is also another indication which has been insufficiently taken into account by Prieur and Hornschuh. When Stratocles is introduced, the author tells us that Caesar had excused him from the army so that he could dedicate himself to philosophy (1). Evidently, it was impossible to represent the emperor as being opposed to military service, but the author's intentions become clearer in the Coptic fragment, where we hear of a young man who, like the centurion mentioned by Tertullian in his *De corona* (1), had thrown off his uniform and dropped his sword (*AAco* 9)²⁵ – a passage perhaps to be connected, as Prieur suggests, with the soldiers who threaten the apostle in Thrace (*AAlat* 9)²⁶. Now the question of the acceptability of military service hardly occurs in the Christian literature of the first and second centuries, but suddenly becomes prominent around the beginning of the third century, when, presumably, the Christian faith had started to make inroads into the Roman army²⁷. In other words, the theme of the rejection of military service also points to a date for the AA towards the end of the second century or the beginning of the third.

After these observations on the author, place and period of the AA, it is time to look at some of its more prominent aspects. In line with my earlier investigations of the *AJ*, *AP* and *APt* I will look at (1) man, (2) magic and exorcism, and (3) martyrdom as reflected in the AA.

²⁴ M. Hornschuh, in W. Schneemelcher (ed), *New Testament Apocrypha* II (London, 1965) 395-7. Prieur: see note 6.

²⁵ I quote the Coptic fragment from the edition in Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 655-71. For the Coptic translation note now also T.S. Richter, 'P. Ien. inv. 649: Ein Splitter vom koptischen Text der Acta Andreae', *Arch. f. Papyrusforschung* 44 (1998) 275-84.

²⁶ Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 588, who on p. 327 notes the author's rejection of military service, but does not draw any chronological conclusions from his observation.

²⁷ A very full bibliography on this theme: F. Ruggiero, *Tertulliano, De Corona* (Milan, 1992) XLIV-XLVIII; add J. Roldanus, 'De vroege kerk en de militaire dienst', *Kerk en Theologie* 33 (1982) 182-202; P.W. van der Horst, *De onbekende God* (Utrecht, 1988) 210-28.

1. *Man*

How are males and females represented in the *AA*? Let us start with the depiction of the brothers Stratocles and Aegeates, both noble Romans. When Stratocles saw his beloved servant Alcmanes in the grip of a demon, he wanted to commit suicide because of his great grief (2). Moreover, he is depicted as groaning, sighing and incessantly weeping (8, 43) – hardly the accepted behaviour of the Roman upper class.

Aegeates does not fare much better. To start with, his status is evidently compromised by his own admission that he was of a lower status than his wife (36; *AAlat* 24). Relationships in which a Christian woman was socially superior to her pagan partner did indeed occur. They were even condoned by Pope Callistus, but it is not clear whether our passage presupposes such practices²⁸. Aegeates' lower status was also reflected in his behaviour. He was a drunkard (18), a glutton (46) and, like his brother, he threatened to commit suicide when his wife was very seriously ill (*AAlat* 30). In addition, he was slow-witted, since for eight months a female slave, Eukleia, could pretend to be his wife in bed, despite the fact that he is pictured as being a husband in love – a mistake admittedly made easier by the Roman upper-class custom of making love in the dark²⁹. Aegeates also did not always move in the right way. When once he was acting as a judge, he suddenly remembered the apostle, rose from the bench and ran 'like a madman' to the praetorium (35), whereas a real Roman (or Greek) gentleman of course was never seen running in public; even Maximilla, although in haste, moved 'not rashly or without set purpose' (46)³⁰.

Even worse, when Aegeates was at the point of discovering Andrew and the brethren in Maximilla's chamber, he was struck with a stomach-ache and had to sit a long time on a kind of toilet (13) – not a very dignified sight for a Roman governor! In this passage the

²⁸ Hipp. Ref. 9.12.24-5; Tert. *Ad uxorem*, 2.8.

²⁹ Ov. *AA* 2.619f, *Am* 1.5.7f; Mart. 11.2.4, 11.104.5, 12.43.10; Tac. *Ann.* 15.37.

³⁰ For walking among the Greeks and Romans see Bremmer, 'Walking, standing and sitting in ancient Greek culture' and F. Graf, 'Gestures and conventions: the gestures of Roman actors and orators', in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds), *A Cultural History of Gesture* (Cambridge, 1991) 15-35 at 18-20 and 36-58 at 55, respectively.

author has visible pleasure in depicting the highest Roman official in a less than respectable situation: an interesting testimony to the possibilities which Greeks had of expressing their true opinion about their rulers³¹.

Moreover, Aegeates was very cruel. After his detection of Eukleia's cheating he had her fellow slaves, who had informed him about her deceit, crucified. As for Eukleia herself, her tongue, hands and feet were cut off and 'after remaining some days without nourishment she became food for the dogs' (22). Crucifixion was a customary Roman penalty for slaves, although not uncommon in the Greek world, whereas the other measures seem to have been typically Greek in origin³².

Similar cruelty was also displayed by the anonymous proconsul in, perhaps, Amaseia, who ordered a young man, Sostratus, with whom his mother had fallen hopelessly in love, to be executed using the *culleus* of the parricide (AAlat 4)³³. This typically Roman penalty may seem out of place in this Greek environment, but in the Greek mentality incest and parricide were closely related³⁴, and the passage may thus reflect the original. In both these cases the behaviour of the Roman pagan proconsuls is in sharp contrast with the gentleness and affability of the converted Stratocles.

In one case, even a Christian prostitute could be more imposing than a pagan male. The wife of the proconsul Lesbios, whom we will

³¹ The example is not mentioned by H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt* (Berlin, 1938); J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund, 1959).

³² Greek crucifixions: M. Hengel, *Crucifixion* (London, 1977) 69-83; J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie* (Paris, 1983) 259-63; É. Puech, 'Notes sur 11Q19 LXIV 6-13 et 4Q524 14, 2-4. À propos de la crucifixion dans le Rouleau de Temple et dans le judaïsme ancien', *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997) 109-24. Tongue: 2 Macc. 7.4; Plut. M.849B; 4 Macc. 10.19, 12.13; Origen, *Mart.* 23. Hands and feet: Pol. 5.54.10, 8.21.3; 2 Macc. 7.4; Diod. Sic. 34.8; 4 Macc. 10.20; Aug. *De gestis cum Emerito* 9 (PL 43.704: a bishop's tongue and hands cut off).

³³ For a fascinating study of the penalty with rich bibliography, see F. Egmond and P. Mason, *The Mammoth and the Mouse* (Baltimore and London, 1997) 133-56 ('The longue durée of ritual punishment').

³⁴ Parricide and incest: Bremmer (ed), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London, 1988²) 49-51; add A. Moreau, 'La liaison entre parricide, inceste et cannibalisme. Compléments', *Cahiers du GITA* 1 (1985) 49-56.

meet again as a real sinner, condemned her husband's former concubine, Trophime, to a brothel, a not uncommon penalty³⁵. Here she was protected by an *euangelium* hidden in her bosom. Apparently, this method of protection proved very helpful, since it made impotent all those who wanted to 'touch' her (*contingeret*) and helped to kill a youth who wanted to 'sexually humiliate' her (*inluderet*: AAlat 23)³⁶. This power of the gospel also becomes apparent in the case of an old man of 74, evidently still *compos mentulae*, who had converted after a life of debauchery and carried an *euangelium* with him³⁷. Yet life-long habits are not easily shed. He again succumbed to his lust and approached a prostitute, but this time she did not let him get near her – evidently, she had felt the presence of the gospel (28).

According to Prieur, these episodes must have been introduced by Gregory or a later translator (revisor?) of the text, since contemporary testimonies for 'magical' use of a gospel are non-existent. Now it is true that Christian miniature codices are usually later than the time of the AA³⁸, but, as Prieur also recognises, such a use of the gospel as talisman might have been derived from contemporaneous Jewish practice, which used small codices of the Torah for magical protection³⁹. Moreover, Jerome already reproaches *superstitiosae mulierculae* for carrying small gospels on their persons like the Pharisees with their phylacteries, and small gospels have been found in graves from the fourth or fifth century onwards – surely as amulets⁴⁰.

³⁵ Bremmer, *Acts of John*, 51; add now F. Rizzo Nervo, 'La vergine e il lupanare', in *La narrativa cristiana antica* (Rome, 1995) 91-9.

³⁶ In late Latin, *contingere* is a well attested euphemism for sexual intercourse, cf. J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982) 184; for *inludo* see Adams, *ibidem*, 200.

³⁷ For the sexual connotation of *exercere* in AAlat 28, cf. Adams, *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, 158 n. 1.

³⁸ E. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia, 1977) 22, 30; add *Historia Lausiaca* 8; *P.Kell.* 91, 92, 94 and *P.Kell.Copt.* 1.

³⁹ Prieur, *Acta Andreae*, 622 n.6; L. Blau, 'Das neue Evangelienfragment von Oxyrhynchos buch- und zaubergeschichtlich betrachtet nebst sonstigen Bemerkungen', *ZNW* 9 (1908) 204-15; S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942) 110ff.

⁴⁰ J. Vezin, 'Les livres utilisés comme amulettes et comme reliques', in P. Ganz (ed), *Das Buch als magisches und als Repräsentationsobjekt* (Wiesbaden, 1992) 100-15 at 103-5.

It is, then, not impossible that these episodes were already part of the original *AA*.

When we now survey our evidence, we cannot fail to observe a clear contrast between men and women, and there can be little doubt as to which category comes off better. On the whole, except for the apostle, males are depicted as rather feeble and having difficulty controlling themselves, just as they are in the *AJ*. As was the case with the *AJ* and *AP*, we thus once again feel that educated, wealthy women were an important part of *AA*'s intended readership⁴¹.

2. *Magic and exorcism*

Any reader of the *AA* will be struck by the multitude of references to magic, demons and exorcism. We cannot discuss in detail all the relevant passages, but we can certainly pose questions such as: who is the magician? Where are the demons and what do they look like? How do they affect the possessed? How does the apostle approach them and how do they react? How does the victim of demonic possession respond to his exorcism? In what kind of context does exorcism take place? And what is the reaction of the public? Investigation into ancient exorcism has rarely transcended the stage of collecting the facts, but we must always take into account that exorcism is a ritual scenario which takes place between the exorcist, the person possessed, the demon(s) and the public. Any analysis which neglects one of these aspects presents us with an only inadequate view of this ancient ritual⁴².

Let us start with the magician. In the Coptic fragment a young magician says before 'attacking' a Christian girl: 'If I have spent five and twenty years under the instruction of my master until I was trained in his skill, this is the beginning of my craft' (*AAco* 10). The

⁴¹ For female readership see now my observations in Bremmer, 'The Novel', 171-8.

⁴² For exorcism see K. Thraede, 'Exorzismus', *RAC* 7 (Stuttgart, 1969) 44-117 (learned but insufficient on the *AAA*); P. Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (London, 1982) 123-6; R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth, 1986) 327-30; R. Kotansky, 'Greek Exorcistic Amulets', in M. Meyer and P. Mirecki (eds), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden, 1995) 243-77. For modern Greece, Ch. Stewart, *Demons and the Devil* (Princeton, 1991) 211-21.

passage is an interesting, albeit neglected, testimony for the ancient belief that magic could only be learnt after many years of instruction, preferably in Egypt⁴³. So Celsus reproached Jesus for having learned magic in Egypt⁴⁴; according to later legend, Bishop Cyprian had been ten years with the Memphitic priests training to become a magician (*Conf.* 12)⁴⁵, and Lucian's lover of lies had spent twenty-three years in subterranean chambers in Memphis where Isis had trained him to become a magician (*Philopseudeis* 34-6). Clearly, after an even longer period of instruction our magician should have been a formidable opponent of the apostle!

The same teacher-pupil relationship perhaps underlies the episode of Exuos, an upper-class youth, who had left his parents in order to follow Andrew. When they tried to smoke out the apostle with the help of a military cohort, their son extinguished the fire with a dish of water. The parents realised that their plan had failed and exclaimed: 'Look, our son has become a magician!' Not wholly surprisingly, they had identified Andrew as a master magician (*AAlat* 11).

The young magician did not speak himself, but, according to the apostle, it was the demon Semmath who had entered him (*AAco* 10). According to Prieur (*ad loc.*), Semmath may well have been the devil and must have been introduced by the Coptic translator, but he rightly does not follow Quispel's suggestion that Semmath is the demon Sammael of the Latin translation of the *Acts of Andrew and Matthias* (24)⁴⁶. Unfortunately, both Quispel and Prieur overlooked a close relative of this demon, the undoubtedly related demon Sammoth from one of the Leiden magical papyri (*PGM* XII. 79).

⁴³ For Egypt as the country of magic *par excellence* see F. Graf, 'How to Cope with a Difficult Life. A View of Ancient Magic' and D. Frankfurter, 'Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category "Magician",' in H. Kippenberg and P. Schäfer (eds), *Envisioning Magic* (Leiden, 1997) 93-114 at 94-5 and 115-35 at 119-21, respectively.

⁴⁴ Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.28, 38, 46; *bSanh* 107b; B. Kollmann, *Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter* (Göttingen, 1996) 179-81; E. Bammel, *Judaica et Paulina* (Tübingen, 1997) 3-14 ('Jesus der Zauberer').

⁴⁵ For the text see *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. vol. VII, 204 ff; H.M. Jackson, 'A contribution toward an edition of the *Confession* of Cyprian of Antioch, the *secreta Cypriani*', *Le Muséon* 101 (1988) 33-40.

⁴⁶ G. Quispel, 'An Unknown Fragment of the Acts of Andrew', *VigChris* 10 (1956) 129-48 at 137 n.4.

Magicians were traditionally believed to be accompanied by a demon who helped them perform their magic, the so-called *parhedros*⁴⁷. According to Irenaeus, the heretic Marcus had such a 'demonic assistant (*daimona parhedron*), through whom he himself seems to prophesy and through whom he rouses to prophecy those women whom he thinks worthy of participating in the grace' (*Adv. Haer.* 1.13.3). As the assistant was indispensable, he is sometimes even mentioned right at the beginning of a ritual, such as in a Berlin magical papyrus: 'A [demon comes] as an assistant who will reveal everything to you clearly and will be your [companion and] will eat and sleep with you'⁴⁸.

Often, though, demons do not belong to a specific magician but seem to be independent beings who sometimes lurk in specific places. It is rather striking for us moderns to find them regularly in the baths⁴⁹, a belief abundantly illustrated by the AA. When Andrew comes near Sinope, he heals the son of Cratinus, who had been 'struck' (see below) by a demon when frequenting the women's bath (*AAlat* 5). Subsequently, in Patras he resurrected the wife of Lesbios, Callista, who, whilst taking a bath together with her steward (see the introduction), had been 'struck' by a demon (*AAlat* 23). Finally, in Corinth he exorcised both an old man and a youth whom he had met in the baths (*AAlat* 27). Gregory's narration supplies no more information about the last case, but in the earlier ones we can easily recognise the underlying pagan and Christian objection to mixed bathing⁵⁰.

⁴⁷ C. Zintzen, *Kleine Pauly* 4 (1972) 510f; Th. Hopfner, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber* I, 1921¹ (Amsterdam, 1974²) §1ff; C. Colpe, *RAC* 10 (Stuttgart, 1974) 621ff; L. Ciruolo, 'Supernatural Assistants in Greek Magical Papyri', in Meyer and Mirecki, *Ancient Magic*, 279-95; F. Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge MA, 1997) 107-16.

⁴⁸ *PGM* I.1-3. All translations from magical papyri are from H.D. Betz (ed), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* I (Chicago, 1992²).

⁴⁹ C. Bonner, 'Demons of the Bath', in *Studies Presented to F.Ll. Griffith* (London, 1932) 203-8; Hopfner, *Offenbarungszauber* I §195; K. Dunbabin, 'Baiaurum grata voluptas: pleasures and dangers of the baths', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 57 (1989) 6-46.

⁵⁰ For mixed bathing see Mart. 7.35, 11.75; Juv. 6.422f; Clem.Alex. *Paed.* 3.5.32; A. Hilhorst, 'Erotic Elements in the *Shepherd* of Hermas', in Hofmann and Zimmerman, *Groningen Colloquia* IX, 193-204 at 196.

The demons manifested themselves in rather different ways. The demon who had struck the proconsul's wife and her steward is simply called a *daemon teterrimus*, but those who assaulted the proconsul Lesbios were 'Aethiopians', pitch-black men, a favourite manifestation of ancient demons (*AAlat* 22)⁵¹. They could even show up as animals. In Nicaea seven demons lived in tombs along the road (*AAlat* 5, 7), another place fit for demons, just as their number, seven, is typical of groups of demons in the New Testament⁵². When the apostle arrived in the city, the Nicaeans approached him with olive branches, not, as Prieur suggests (*ad loc.*), in imitation of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, but in the Greek mode of supplication⁵³. The apostle gave in to their entreaties and ordered the demons to show themselves. At that very moment they appeared as dogs, one more indication of the ambivalent standing of the dog among Jews and Greeks⁵⁴.

How did the demons affect their victims? As the above mentioned examples show, some victims felt 'struck', 'beaten' or 'whipped' by the demons. We do not find this belief in a 'blow' by a demon in the New Testament, but just as the wife of the proconsul and her steward were *percussi* by a demon (*AAlat* 23), so Stratocles' servant Alcmanes was *ab impulsu daemonis percussus* (2; *AAlat* 34). Indeed, the explanation of illness or possession as the result of a stroke is very widespread and regularly occurs in the magical papyri, where, for example, in a recipe for a love spell the advice is to 'glue it to the dry vaulted vapour room of a bath, and you will marvel. But watch yourself so that you are not struck'. A variant of the 'stroke' was a 'lash', a belief perhaps reflected in the

⁵¹ Bremmer, *Acts of Peter*, 8; add J. Clarke, 'Hypersexual Black Men in Augustan Baths: Ideal Somatypes and Apotropaic Magic', in N.B. Kampen (ed), *Sexuality in Ancient Art. Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy* (Cambridge, 1996) 184-98.

⁵² Tombs: Mt 8.28; Mk 5.2,3,5; Lk 8.27; *Test. Sol.* 17.2; H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* IV.1 (Munich, 1928) 516f. Seven: Ez. 9.1f; Mt 12.45; Mk 16.9; Lk 8.2, 11.26; *Test. Sol.* 8.1. Canine demons: H.-J. Loth, 'Hund', *RAC* 16 (Stuttgart, 1994) 773-828 at 822f; add *Test. Sol.* 10.1-4.

⁵³ Bremmer, 'Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece', *HSCPh* 87 (1983) 299-320 at 318f; add for a contemporary parallel Apuleius, *Met.* 3.8.

⁵⁴ Loth, 'Hund'.

proconsul Lesbios' feeling of being 'whipped' by 'Ethiopians' (AAlat 22)⁵⁵.

From the Middle Ages until virtually our own times, possessed people also display socially unacceptable behaviour and extreme signs of motor disorder, often with contortions and dislocations. It is no different in the AA. The old man in the bath (above) trembled (AAlat 27). Some servants of Antiphanes were 'grinding their teeth...and insanely laughing' (AAlat 29)⁵⁶. Other people even lost all control over their limbs. The son of Cratinus went mad and fell on the ground in front of the apostle (5). In the Coptic fragment the soldier fell on the ground and started to foam at the mouth (AAco 9), just like Stratocles' servant Alcmanes, who was moreover 'utterly convulsed' and sitting on a dungheap (2-3; AAlat 34), not a very dignified position. One may at least pose the question of how far these possessions, or their descriptions, were dependent on the New Testament where, for example, in Mark the boy with the dumb spirit 'convulsed the boy, and he fell on the ground and rolled about, foaming at the mouth' (9.20)⁵⁷.

It could be even worse. The Nicaean canine demons killed the son of aged parents (AAlat 7), just as a demon killed the proconsul's wife and her steward (AAlat 23), and strangled the son of a Thessalonian (AAlat 14). In the latter case one may well wonder whether the narrative here does not exaggerate the feeling of suffocation which is attested for some possessed people. Exaggeration certainly plays a role in the earlier scenes and this raises a problem to which we will return immediately, viz. to what extent these scenes were stock descriptions rather than representations of reality.

How did the apostle react to the demonic powers? Whereas he had taken the initiative in addressing the Nicaean canine demons, it was usually the other way round. For example, in Philippi a youth cried out: 'What is there between you and me, Andrew? Have you

⁵⁵ PGM XXXVI.76; see also PGM VII.282; Ptol. *Tetrabl.* 3.14; S. Eitrem, *Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament* (Oslo, 1966²) 36f; A. Stramaglia, *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino* (Bari, 1999) 330; for the widespread background of this belief see L. Honko, *Krankheitsprojekte* (Helsinki, 1959).

⁵⁶ Teeth: Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis* 12.10. Laughter: Bremmer, *Acts of Peter*, 11; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 4.20; Aretaeus 3.6.

⁵⁷ Note also the description in Lucian, *Philopseudeis* 16.

come to chase us from our proper place?' (AAlat 17). Virtually the same approach takes place in a Corinthian bath, when a youth addresses Andrew with: 'What is there between you and me? Have you come here to unsettle us from our place?' (AAlat 27). These initiatives are clearly influenced by the New Testament, where the possessed Gadarenes address Jesus first with the words: 'What have we to do with you, son of God?' (Mt. 8.29, cf. Mk. 1.24, 5.7, Lk 8.28), and they are thus not likely to be authentic⁵⁸, but in Megara all the demons cried out in unison (*unius vocis impetu*): 'Why do you chase us here, holy Andrew?' (AAlat 29), which makes a more convincing impression. The demonic initiative is probably to be explained by the public arena in which the confrontation takes place. Before the community can accept that the possessed persons are healed, it has to be convinced that the demons have actually left. So the demons have to make themselves manifest before they can be properly expelled.

Not all demons were highly cooperative, though, and in the magical papyri a magician therefore says: 'I conjure you, every daemonic spirit, to tell whatever sort you may be, because I conjure you by the seal which Solomon placed on the tongue of Jeremiah, and he told'⁵⁹. For those who persisted in keeping silent, the papyri supply an effective recipe: 'If you say the Name to a demoniac while putting sulphur and asphalt to his nose, the demon will speak at once and go away'⁶⁰.

Normal people might have been frightened by the sudden outbursts of the demons, but an apostle is of course not that easily impressed. In the case of the possessed house of Antiphanes, Andrew can react as if there is nothing strange about the situation (*nimis* [read: *nihil*] *de his admirans*: AAlat 29). Similarly, after having been invoked by Maximilla in order to heal Alcmanes who was 'foaming at the mouth', he entered 'smiling' (3). The reader is left in no doubt that our hero will confront the 'villain' and convincingly despatch him. But how does he do it?

⁵⁸ For the Old Testament background of the formula (1 Kings 17.18) see O. Bächli, "'Was habe ich mit Dir zu schaffen?'. Eine formelhafte Frage im A.T. und N.T.', *Theol. Zs.* 33 (1977) 69-80; P. Guillemette, 'Mc 1,24 est-il une formule de défense magique?', *SCEs* 30 (1978) 81-96.

⁵⁹ *PGM* IV.3037-41; see also Lucian, *Philopseudeis*, 16; Theophilus, *Autolyc.* 2.8; *ATh* 74; *Test. Sol.* 5.2ff, 13.2.

⁶⁰ *PGM* XIII.242-4; note also Josephus, *Ant.* 8.47.

At first it may seem surprising how unimpressive the actual exorcism sometimes is. In the case of Alcmanes, the apostle simply invokes God in a prayer in the characteristic participial style once so well analysed by Eduard Norden: 'O God, who does not hearken to the magicians... grant now that my request be speedily fulfilled before all these in the slave of Stratocles, putting to flight the demon whom his kinsmen could not drive out' (5; *AAlat* 34)⁶¹. In the Coptic fragment, he addresses the soldier with: 'It is now fully time for you to come out from this young man, that he may gird himself for the heavenly palace' (*AAco* 14). In other cases the apostle seems to be less quiet. To the son of Cratinus he speaks *increpans*: 'Go away from the servant of God, you enemy of the human race' (*AAlat* 5), and the same verb is used when he expels the demons from the old man and the youth in the swimming pool (*AAlat* 27). This approach was probably more like real practice, since both Jesus and Apollonius of Tyana, too, were sometimes agitated while exorcising demons and rebuked them⁶². The order '*discede*' will also have been part of traditional Jewish exorcism, since the command *exelthe* is a recurrent term in New Testament exorcism stories and occurs in the magical papyri⁶³, but is absent from pagan exorcisms⁶⁴.

Faced with the supernatural power of the apostle, what could a demon do? In the Coptic fragment the demon quietly leaves the young soldier on the order of Andrew and assures him that 'I have never destroyed a limb of his' (*AAco* 14). In the case of Alcmanes, the demon uses the term 'fleeing': 'I flee, servant and man of God, I flee not only from this slave, but also from this whole city' (5) – the

⁶¹ For the participle style see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart, 1912) 166-8.

⁶² Eitrem, *Some Notes*, 51f, who compares Mk 1.43, 2.12 and Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 4.20; add Mk 9.25; Lucian, *Philopseudeis*, 16, 31; Philostratus 3.38; H.C. Kee, 'The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories', *New Test. Stud.* 14 (1967-8) 232-46 at 240ff; Thraede, 'Exorzismus', 51, 66 (many more examples).

⁶³ Mk 1.25, 5.8, 9.25; Acts 16.18; compare also *APt* 11; *ATh* 73,74 and 77; Cyprian, *Ep.* 69.15; *PGM* IV.1227, 1242-4, 3007ff and V.158; Thraede, 'Exorzismus', 52; D. Jordan and R. Kotansky, 'A Salomonic Exorcism (Inv. T 3)', in M. Gronewald *et al.*, *Kölner Papyri* 8 (Opladen, 1997) 53-69 at 55f.

⁶⁴ As is observed by Kollmann, *Jesus und die Christen*, 202.

terminology of actual exorcistic formulae⁶⁵. That was not enough for Andrew, but by ordering the demon to stay away from wherever the Christians were he showed the extent of his power⁶⁶.

Not all demons were so placid, however. The demon of Cratinus' son left *multo clamitans* (AAlat 5) and a soldier even died when the demon left him (AAlat 18). The last example looks like a narrative exaggeration of a traditional theme in exorcism: the demon's dramatisation of his departure by an act of physical violence. The theme is already present in Mark, where evil spirits leave amid loud shouting (1.26, 9.20) or even destroy a herd of swine (5.13), but it must have been part and parcel of the contemporary exorcist's trade⁶⁷.

Naturally, not only had the demon to demonstrate his departure, but the exorcised persons too had to show that they had been healed. So Alcmanes rose from the floor and sat down with Andrew 'sound in mind and tranquil and talking normally' (5). Once again these aspects have to be seen against the public character of the ritual. It is only when everybody has noticed the expulsion of the demon and the recovery of the possessed that he can function again in the community.

The last actor in this scenario to be considered is the public. During resurrections crowds are always prominently present and acclaim the apostle with traditional formulae such as: '*Magnus est Deus Christus, quem praedicat servus eius Andreas*' (AAlat 7)⁶⁸, '*Non est similis tibi, Domine*' (AAlat 24) or '*Non est similis deo Andreae*' (AAlat 13), the latter exclamation typically being uttered in the theatre⁶⁹. But what about exorcisms? The great Gibbon, who called exorcism 'the awful ceremony', thought that the ritual was performed

⁶⁵ Kotansky, 'Greek Exorcistic Amulets', 258f.

⁶⁶ For *Geisterbannung* in general see O. Weinreich, 'Gebet und Wunder. Zwei Abhandlungen zur Religions- und Literaturgeschichte', in *Genethliakon. Wilhelm Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag am 24. Febr. 1929* (Stuttgart, 1929) 169-464, repr. in Weinreich, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Stuttgart, 1968) 1-298.

⁶⁷ For more examples see C. Bonner, 'The Technique of Exorcism', *HThR* 26 (1943) 39-49 and his supplement in *HThR* 27 (1944) 334-6; L. Delatte, *Un office byzantin d'exorcisme* (Brussels, 1957) p. 30.1, 54.17, 56.16, 84.11, 90.10, 91.6, 92.2 and 21.

⁶⁸ For the acclamation 'Great is...' see H.S. Versnel, *Ter unus* (Leiden, 1990) 194-6; note also *AA Mart. pr.* 6

⁶⁹ For the theatre as the place of performance in Late Antiquity see Bremmer, *Acts of John*, 47.

in front of many spectators and so led to the 'conviction of infidels'⁷⁰. And indeed, it is true that in the time of the European religious wars, exorcism had often been the arena in which Catholics and Protestants had tried to establish the superiority of their faith⁷¹. In the AA, however, and other early Christian literature we notice nothing of this crowd activity. On the contrary, Christian and pagan authors alike stress that the Christians exorcised in a manner as simple as possible. Apparently, they wanted at all costs to avoid the dangerous accusation of being magicians, and thus they practised without the usual hocus pocus of traditional magicians⁷². That is also why magicians are shown up in the AA in a bad light (AAco) and are proved to be ineffective (4), and why accusations of magic are immediately refuted (AAlat 18; *Mart. pr.* 3-4). As far as we can see from the surviving parts of the AJ and AP, the theme of magic played virtually no role in these works. Can it be that the increasing measures taken by the Roman government against magic are also reflected in the prominence of the theme in the APt and AA, AAA which are to be dated later than the earlier two⁷³? There is a problem here which cannot immediately be solved.

3. Martyrdom

Let us conclude our study with a few observations on the event of martyrdom as represented by the AA. We have two scenes which

⁷⁰ E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* II, ed. Bury (London, 1896) 28f.

⁷¹ C. Ernst, *Teufelsaustreibung: die Praxis der katholischen Kirche im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Berne and Toronto, 1972); D.P. Walker, *Unclean Spirits* (London, 1981); S. Greenblatt, 'Loudon and London', *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1985-6) 326-46; idem, *Shakespearian Negotiations* (Oxford, 1988) 94-128; H. de Waardt, *Toverij en samenleving. Holland 1500-1800* (The Hague, 1991) 171-4.

⁷² H. Remus, *Pagan-Christian Conflict over Miracle in the Second Century* (Cambridge MA, 1983) 52-72.

⁷³ For these measures see M.Th. Fögen, *Die Enteignung der Wahrsager. Studien zum kaiserlichen Wissensmonopol in der Spätantike* (Frankfurt, 1993); H. Kippenberg, 'Magic in Roman Civil Discourse: Why Rituals could be Illegal', in Kippenberg and Schäfer, *Envisioning Magic*, 137-63; V. Neri, *I marginali nell' Occidente tardo antico* (Bari, 1998) 258-86.

show us something of the suffering of the early Christians. In the first case, the proconsul Varianus condemns Andrew to the beasts⁷⁴. As was customary, the proconsul let the beasts and the apostle enter the arena early in the morning⁷⁵. First, they let loose a wild boar at Andrew, but apparently the animal was not interested in the apostle. This must have happened relatively often in the arena and could of course easily be interpreted as an act of God⁷⁶. Next came a bull, the use of which animal is well known from Blandina's martyrdom in the *Letter of Lyons*. It killed the *venatores*, the professional fighters against beasts, who had goaded it on; the same fate is suffered by the attendant who had tied Saturus to a boar in the *Passio Perpetuae* (19)⁷⁷. Finally, there came a most ferocious leopard, who spurned the apostle completely but instead jumped up to the special seat of the proconsul and killed his son. The scene is surely legendary, but it must have been illustrative of the ferocity of the leopard: in the *Passio Perpetuae* Saturus hoped to be killed by one bite of a leopard. This whole passage of the AA is only sketchy, but it shows something of what the Christians had to suffer for their faith.

The second instance is the death of Andrew. After a long conversation between Stratocles and Andrew, the apostle told him: 'Tomorrow Aegeates will hand me over to be crucified' (45). The term used, *anaskolopidzo*, can mean 'to impale' and 'to crucify'⁷⁸. Given the cruel treatment of the slave Eukleia, for a moment the reader is left in doubt in which way Andrew is to be killed. However, his doubts are soon resolved, since the proconsul opted for crucifixion (46).

As was the case earlier, the preparations for the execution started at dawn. In the customary Roman way, the apostle was whipped first⁷⁹, but Aegeates gave orders 'to leave his sinews uncut' (51), a

⁷⁴ Unlike Prieur (*ad loc.*), I prefer the name Varianus, which also occurs in *AAco* 9 and which is widely attested, cf. *P.Oxy.* 3.486.1, 9.1201.16, 12.1475.10, 14.1642.4 and 1727.1; *P.Kron.* 3.1; *P.Diog.* 6.3 (Egypt); *SEG* 37.544.2, 4 (Macedonia); *I.Prusias* 7.2.22; *TAM* III. 118.3, 180.3, 596.2 en 697.1 (Termessos); C. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Tübingen, 1993) 136 nr. 3 (Pompeiopolis).

⁷⁵ Add this case to Bremmer, *Acts of Paul*, 53.

⁷⁶ Prieur (*ad loc.*) compares *AP* 28, 33-5; Eus. *HE*.5.1.41-2.

⁷⁷ L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta* V (Amsterdam, 1989) 809f.

⁷⁸ P. Franchi' de Cavalieri, *Scritti agiografici* II (Rome, 1962) 160.

⁷⁹ Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 21.

detail for which I have been unable as yet to find a parallel. Unlike normal Roman practice⁸⁰, Andrew did not need to carry his own cross, as Jesus had to do, but a cross had been prepared for him at the edge of the sea. The place is intriguing but may be a reminiscence of the Greek practice to dispose of polluted beings at the beach, a typically ambivalent place between land and sea⁸¹.

To prolong his suffering, the proconsul had given orders that instead of using nails he should be tied to the cross by his hands and feet. Once again, we feel the contrast between the gentleness of Stratocles and the cruelty of his brother. As was the case with Thecla, the population now became restless and protested to Aegeates⁸², who had apparently remained in the city to continue with his court cases. He immediately left his *bêma*, his seat, which is repeatedly mentioned in the AAA⁸³. However, he arrived to speak with the apostle, who died after glorifying God and after being glorified by the author. The wretched proconsul committed suicide shortly afterwards.

The difference in values manifested by the pagan proconsul and his Christian brother, as well as those displayed in the deaths of the proconsul and the apostle, already suggest the turning of the tables, but more than a century was to pass before Christianity won a definitive victory⁸⁴.

⁸⁰ S. Lieberman, *Texts and Studies* (New York, 1974) 92f.

⁸¹ R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983) 226f.

⁸² For such protests see Bremmer, *Acts of Paul*, 51; add AA 60 and AAlat 18.

⁸³ Bremmer, *Acts of Paul*, 46; add AA 36, AAlat 4; E. Dinkler, *Signum crucis* (Tübingen, 1967) 118-33 (archaeological evidence); Lieberman, *Texts and Studies*, 69, 83 (occurrence in Jewish sources).

⁸⁴ For comments, information and correction of my English I am most grateful to Kathy Coleman, David Frankfurter, Stephen Harrison, Ton Hilhorst, Peter van Minnen and Jacques van der Vliet.